



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

I had many other things in mind to say, but my friend was becoming restless. I should have liked to point out to him the value of the sciences for citizenship. I had in mind a particularly telling thrust, in revenge for his depreciation of the general sociologist, to be delivered by calling in question the utility of the six-year course of the modern medical school, in which he is interested, on the ground that it is very largely a process of instilling into the future physician the general conclusions or generalizations of the various medical sciences. I contented myself, however, with remarking in conclusion that, "Generalization is always valuable in all subjects. Like concrete specialized investigation, we cannot have too much of it, and we should encourage it heartily whenever any competent person is willing to undertake it. Unsatisfactory and incomplete as any one synthetic study must always be, it is a stepping-stone to something better, because it gives orientation and stimulation either to complete or to refute it. It is a point of departure."

My friend merely said: "I came by to see if you would like to try your hand at a game of golf." I took my clubs and went out with him, leaving the future of sociology and of all science except that of the nine holes, in abeyance.

L. L. BERNARD.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

WHAT IS ESSENTIAL IN TEACHING PHILOSOPHY?

Practically every college in the country to-day demands that its students take a certain number of courses in philosophy. If you were to ask why these courses in philosophy are demanded from a student before he can graduate, the answers would undoubtedly be vague and hazy. The probability is that no two people would agree on just why it is essential that students take these courses in philosophy.

The prime reason for demanding that students spend a certain amount of time in the study of philosophy is due without doubt to tradition and custom. During the past decades a certain amount of philosophical culture was necessary, just as a certain amount of classical culture was necessary to any one who wished to be classified as a person of culture. Our curriculum traditions have undergone a change in respect to classical languages, and their importance has decreased and is decreasing with the passing time, due largely

to economic pressure, but philosophy still holds its time-honored, hoary place upon the list of requirements prescribed for students before they can graduate.

This philosophical mill through which the prospective bachelor of philosophy or of arts must pass has its humorous as well as its tragic side. There is a humor in seeing these students pigeonholed into certain courses in philosophy. Blindly they are thrust into a course in Greek, medieval, or modern philosophy; perhaps a course in Aristotle, in Kant, in Hegel, or in Dewey. It is entirely a grab-bag arrangement, and the course which is the snappiest, or which has the funniest professor, or which is located in the most convenient building or at the most convenient time is usually selected. The student may thus begin his philosophic studies with Hegel, Kant, Aristotle, Royce without having had any background whatsoever. Sometimes he has had a brief introductory course, which is usually a course of one quarter or one semester covering the entire field of philosophy.

This arrangement, of course, has disastrous results. The students get a certain amount of philosophic knowledge, but this knowledge is not at all connected or related to other facts of life, and is, consequently, as far as the student as an individual is concerned, absolutely valueless. This mass of knowledge, being unrelated and entirely independent of other facts of life, cannot be utilized and is, thus, soon forgotten.

Seldom, if ever, is the attempt made to give students consecutive courses in philosophy. Instructors in philosophy on the whole have not learned the value of knowledge in its setting. They have designed courses which consisted of dipping here and there into the stream of philosophic thought and taking sample courses in Kant, in Hegel, in Plato, in Aristotle with the greatest sangfroid. One student has taken this one, another has taken that one. The knowledge that they have obtained is not knowledge that can help them in their practical life, nor is it knowledge that can help them very much in cultural life, and the quizzical expressions on the faces of some of these students in philosophy is pitiable and is in itself a terrible indictment.

Just what reasons can philosophy give to justify its place on the curriculum of required subjects of the undergraduate? Is the knowledge that one gains in studying various systems of philosophy a knowledge that is useful and essential in practical life? If that

were all that philosophy could give to justify her place, she would indeed deserve to be thrown out at once, tooth and claw. Philosophy is a study that does not put content into the mind, but it develops the individual view-point; it teaches the individual to interpret and evaluate life in a philosophical manner. It furnishes no new materials from which to build new structures of knowledge, but it digs around in the dump hills and ash heaps of commonplaces and finds there rare and costly ornaments and materials which the individual never knew of and which he can use. Philosophy can be compared with a piece of agricultural machinery: the machine does not add anything to the soil, but by using the machine the soil can be better cultivated in a shorter space of time and the result is a vastly increased profit for the owner. Philosophy, then, is a view-point and a method, rather than a certain branch of knowledge, which must be learned and digested into activities of life.

To improve this machinery of the mind, to give this philosophical outlook upon life should be the aim of philosophy. With this aim firmly established it becomes one of the most important and vital subjects that the undergraduate must take. It establishes then for itself a secure, firm basis, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Its value becomes stupendous, for it furnishes the foundation for all the knowledge that the student gathers; it becomes, in other words, the corner-stone for his education. Philosophy will cease to be underestimated as it is now so oftentimes, and will be able to take its place among the subjects that are essential and important.

But just how do we go about this process of improving the machinery of ideas? What are the essential things that must be taken into consideration? The key-word to the whole process is "interest." Material must be selected and handled in such a way that the student's interest will be aroused, his curiosity must be stimulated, and then by proper handling of these materials an abiding interest in philosophy and a philosophical attitude toward life can be created.

Instead of chopping philosophy up, as is the custom at the present time, into logic, ethics, metaphysics and esthetics, we will take the whole field of philosophy as it lies stretched out before us with its beginnings in the distant past, and stake out a clear-cut path through the wilderness. The important philosophers of the ages, those that have contributed heavily to the philosophic thought

of the world, will be studied as a unit. Each philosopher that is dealt with will be discussed from the standpoint of his ethics, his metaphysics, his logic, etc. Instead of giving separate courses in ethics, in logic, in metaphysics, these philosophers will be studied in consecutive order, and thus we shall in a gradual way unfold to the student the philosophical thought of the ages. The instructor need not worry then about holding the interest of his class, for he shall have definitely settled that problem. Philosophy is the most interesting study when handled in a scientific manner. A general course like this in philosophy should run throughout an entire academic year. I know some will shrug their shoulders, if they do nothing worse, at this profanity. "How could it be possible," they will exclaim, "to give a student more than just a bare inkling of the subject in this space of time?" To those I would say: "Examine your teaching methods. If you can't give a student something more than just a superficial knowledge of your subject after you teach him an entire year, there is something wrong with your methods or with you." The philosophy of the present and of the past is not found in great verbosity. In order to give knowledge it is not necessary to use great volumes of words or to wax eloquent in language. Of course, organization is necessary, and it is taken for granted that you know how to present your materials. I know that when I teach a class in general philosophy for an entire year, I shall perhaps not have been able to give them an all-comprehensive knowledge of the subject, but I am assured that they will at least have a fairly thorough knowledge of that subject.

By combining logic, ethics, metaphysics, philosophy of religion all in one a great deal of valuable time will have been saved: moreover, these fields are more or less interrelated, and when we tear them apart and abstract them from each other, as we are doing at the present time, we are creating an artificial division within the mind of the student which is entirely unjustified, and, in consequence, we rob these subjects of a large part of their value. For instance, when you study Plato, why not study his metaphysics, his logic, his ethics, his political philosophy all at once instead of taking each one separate and labeling them under different courses? As I say, you save time and do away with confusion, for if you study Plato in various courses, such as ethics, logic, political philosophy, etc., the odds are that no one student will get all the courses, and the confusion is complete. How long, oh Lord, how long, might

well be our cry, must education be dished out in this single, pigeon-holed style? Let us strike out into the wide sea: let us say farewell to the hampering traditions of the past and let us map out for ourselves a course which shall be in accordance with the light of science.

What should I stress in philosophy to the average student who is not making a special study in the field of philosophy? This is perhaps the question that is heard most frequently. It is an important question, and the way in which this question is answered is what determines whether or no a course in philosophy is a success. To the average student, it seems to me, the ethical and social side of philosophy should be stressed. The ethical side of philosophy, not so much the historical side, but the live ethical questions of the day can be made very interesting, and here the instructor has untold possibilities in developing the thought of his students. He can take live ethical problems and criticize them and pass judgment upon them in the light of the ethical concepts of the past. Of course, some historical background and some psychological background will have to be presented, but by confining himself mostly to the philosophical problems involved he will have the most success. In the same way he can treat the social side of philosophy. This would include politics, religion, etc. Here he would have a field which is just as interesting to-day as it was two thousand years ago. By emphasizing these sides of philosophy the instructor could instil into his class this philosophical attitude which spells rationality and science.

The personal equation cannot be overlooked in the teaching of philosophy. Too often men are chosen for other reasons than ability to fill our chairs of philosophy. This, of course, is entirely unjustifiable. It is customary in many of our universities of to-day to judge a man's teaching ability by a book or some books that he has written. As a matter of fact, this is no gauge for his ability as an instructor. Many men that have a fine literary style are, nevertheless, complete failures as instructors. The inevitable result of this we can see. Every man that is holding down a chair of philosophy, or that is in any way connected with a department of philosophy, is anxiously attempting or has attempted or has succeeded in writing one or more books. I would in no wise belittle these efforts, for they are in themselves very creditable, but is such a course of procedure fair to the students who are in their

classes? During the last ten years a great number of philosophical books, about two hundred and fifty per year, have been dumped on the market. How few of them have attained to any popularity! Books—books—books—and still more books until we are to all intents and purposes snowed under by them. What seems to be our greatest need is to make more students of philosophy so that there may be a public to read these books. We need more honest, earnest endeavor among our instructors in philosophy in regard to their actual teaching of the subject. We must get away from the notion that it is only the successful writer who is the successful instructor. Frequently it is just the opposite: it is the successful instructor who is too busy with his students, too conscientious in his treatment of them, for him to have time to write a book. If instructors could be rated for efficiency would we not often find the first last and last first?

To develop this philosophic attitude toward life should be the aim of philosophy. As stated above, philosophy differs from science in that it can furnish no proof for its conclusions; it can give no content to the mind, but it can turn the mind in certain directions—it can inculcate certain view-points which are essential from a philosophic standpoint. This type of mind can be developed in no other way than through philosophic studies—through a critical survey of the very bases of our existence and of our institutions. It is highly important, nay more, it is essential to the man or woman of to-day who must go out into the mart of the world, to have this philosophic view-point, for it is only through this that they can have poise, self-reliance and ability which come from a well-grounded knowledge and a personal interpretation of life. To develop this philosophic view-point, not to instil some system of philosophy or some code of ethics into the mind of the student, should be the aim of every true instructor in philosophy. Given this aim, the teaching of philosophy becomes the noblest of professions. It means to be a conspicuous unit in the great progress of developing rationality, and more than that, it means bringing to the men and women who study under you a sureness of purpose and a tranquillity of mind which nothing else can give.

GERALD A. KATUIN.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.